

### REMARKS

Claim 1 is revised to identify the central office to which the location information is returned. This revision is considered appropriate to avoid possible ambiguity with respect to the "calling party's central office" and the "called party's central office", both of which are identified earlier in the claim. Claims 17, 33, and 38 are revised to recite --control server-- as a functionally generic term, in place of "service control point". Claims 1-19 and 20-43 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22, 26, 31-36, 38, and 41 are rejected as unpatentable over *Malik* (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,921) in view of newly-cited *Dzuban* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,441). Moreover, the other claims are rejected as unpatentable over those two references in view of certain further secondary references. These rejections assert that *Malik* discloses each element as claimed, except for location information associated with the calling party, and that *Dzuban*, in effect, teaches that missing disclosure such that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include location information for the calling party. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The rejections assert that *Malik* discloses the step of "triggering a query to a service control point from the called party's central office", an element of the overall combination defined by each claim. Column 8, lines 40-49 of *Malik* are cited to support that supposed disclosure. However, a close reading of *Malik* reveals that the reference actually queries a service control point associated with the *calling* party. Thus, lines 40-45 of column 8 in *Malik* teach that a call initiated by the calling party 101 goes to the service switching point (i.e., central office) 100 associated with the calling party. The

SSP 100 then queries an element such as service control point 106. See also Fig. 3 of *Malik*. That service control point 106 then exchanges a series of messages with the calling party 101, enabling the calling party to select an available message from the message delivery database 108 located as part of service control point 106. Please refer to column 9, lines 25-30, 35-37, 56-58; column 10, lines 14-15 and 61-65; and column 11, lines 16-23. Once the calling party has selected the desired response message, the calling party's SSP 100 transmits that message to the SSP 102 that serves the called party (column 12, lines 3-5). *Malik* thus fails to teach or suggest the step of "triggering a query to a service control point from the called party's central office".

*Dzuban* fails to supply that claim element missing from *Malik*. Referring to Fig. 1 and column 3, line 44-column 4, line 9 of *Dzuban*, a signal from the calling party TN1 goes to the exchange UAT of the calling party. Geographical coordinates associated with a calling party are in a coordinate register GKR located in the originating exchange UAT (column 3, lines 31-33). Geographical coordinates from the register GKR are attached to the arriving information from the calling party TN1 and then sent to the services controller SCP associated with the exchange UAT of the calling party. That services controller SCP then forwards a signal tr to the originating exchange UAT, after which the originating exchange forwards a signal to the destination exchange ZAT. That destination exchange, after returning an acknowledgement signal to the originating exchange (column 4, lines 1 and 2 of *Dzuban*), completes the connection between the called party TN2 and the calling party TN1. From the foregoing description, it will be understood that the service control point SCP associated with the central office ZAT of

the called party is not involved with triggering a query to a service control point from the called party's central office.


The foregoing discussion shows that the combination of *Malik* in view of *Dzuban* fails to teach or suggest an element associated with each claim, namely, "triggering a query to a service control point from the called party's central office". Moreover, one of ordinary skill would not have found, in either reference, any teaching or suggestion to modify those references to the extent required to provide that missing limitation. Making that modification would have required a substantial change to the flow of instructions and data taught by each reference. Accordingly, that missing element would have remained neither taught nor suggested to one of ordinary skill, by the applied references. For those reasons, all claims remaining in this application are patentable notwithstanding *Malik* and *Dzuban*.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: August 30, 2004

  
Roger T. Frost  
Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

